Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/895,027	ISELE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lakshmi S. Channavajjala	1615
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>non-final rejection</u>	
(1) <u>Lakshmi S. Channavajjala</u> .	(3)	
(2) Eric Addington.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 August 2006	Time: <u>11 AM</u>	
Type of Interview:  Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: on record		
Claims discussed: on record		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
parada.		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the breadth of claim 9. Examiner suggested to attorney to include the limitation that the second layer has a different composition from the first layer in claim 9, per instant specification and also suggested to replace the term "intermediary" in claim 20 with the term "base lotion", so as to be clear about the volatile component. Attorney authorized the examiner to make the above changes by examiner's amendment.